

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 3, 2008. Prior to the Office Action mailed June 3, 2008, Claims 1-9 and 21-31 were pending in the application. The present Response amends Claims 1, 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-9 and 21-31. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 1-9 and 21-31 are objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to conform to the Examiner's requirement. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, Claims 1-9 and 21-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the limitation "each separate application in the system being guarded by a different copy of the access authorization service such that separate applications in the system do not share authorization services" was rejected as not having been disclosed in the original specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-9 and 21-31 are supported at least based on Paragraph [0074], [0075], and [0082] of the Specification. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, and 21-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie) in view of Donohue (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,204, hereinafter Donohue). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue and further in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,521, hereinafter Wang). Claims 3-4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue, and further in view of Trcka et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039579, hereinafter Trcka) and Microsoft Press (Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, ISBN:157231446XA, 1997, hereinafter Microsoft).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature "*each incremental change to a security policy includes one or more rule changes in a security policy and the accumulated delta is used to generate a new local customized security policy and reconstruct a previously distributed local customized security policy.*" Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is supported by Paragraph [0095] and [0106 – 0125] of the Specification.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Donohue and other prior art do not teach that the accumulated delta is used to reconstruct a previously distributed local customized security policy.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31

Claims 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 22-25 and 27-29

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 22-25 and 27-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Application No.: 10/017,368
Reply to Office Action dated: June 3, 2008
Reply dated: September 3, 2008

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 3, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928